



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,924	03/26/2004	Toni Kopra	872.0180.U1(US)	9401
29683 7590 10/18/2007 HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			EXAMINER SAMS, MATTHEW C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,924

Applicant(s)

KOPRA ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew C. Sams

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12, 16-20, 22-27, 30, 35, 37, 38, 40 and 47-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12, 16-20, 22-27, 30, 35, 37, 38, 40 and 47-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 8/2/2007.
2. Claims 1-9, 12, 16-20, 22-27, 30, 35, 37, 38, 40 and 47-50 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/2/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).
5. In response to the applicant's argument regarding claims 1, 23, 37, 48 and 50 that Barton's input lines are uni-directional in Fig. 1 cannot be an oversight (Page 9), the examiner disagrees.

Barton teaches the event triggers communicates with the user's communication device in order to resolve ambiguity (Page 5 [0048]) through control events (Fig. 1 [174]) and communication events. (Page 6 [0059] "the song excerpt may be increased in length, or a different excerpt may be furnished, in an iterative manner" until a song is identified, Fig. 1 [175] and Page 7 [0067-0068] "Communication events include"... "interactions among users, between users and the service provider, or such

interactions between users, the service provider and third parties”) Further, it is noted that Barton is a pending application and the drawing can be amended to show bi-directionality to support the originally disclosed features within the specification, mainly Page 6 [0059] “the song excerpt may be increased in length, or a different excerpt may be furnished, in an iterative manner” until a song is identified, and Page 7 [0067-0068] “Communication events include”...”interactions among users, between users and the service provider, or such interactions between users, the service provider and third parties”.

6. Further, In re Venner, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958) places the guideline upon examining that it is not an “invention” to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result. It is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art that if a search provides too many responses, more information can be added to the search terms to narrow/focus the results and alternatively, if no results are found, less or a different search term can be tried. The examiner has presented fingerprinting a music file for identification (Wang [Abstract]) and the ability to increase the amount of information provided to resolve ambiguity. (Barton Page 5 [0048-0049] and Page 6 [0059]) Therefore, the original rejection is maintained in view of the further explanation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2617

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-9, 12, 16-17, 22-27, 30, 37, 38, 40 and 47-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (US-6,990,453 hereinafter, Wang) in view of Barton et al. (US 2002/0072982 hereinafter, Barton).

Regarding claim 1, Wang teaches a mobile station (Col. 7 line 67 through Col. 8 line 5) comprising:

an interface to receive a media sample; (Fig. 1 [12] and Col. 5 line 36 through Col. 6 line 15)

a processor to extract a first set of features from a digital version of the media sample; (Col. 6 lines 14-34 and Fig. 1 [14])

a transmitter to transmit the extracted first set of features over a wireless communication link; (Col. 6 line 61 through Col. 7 line 11 and Col. 8 lines 5-24)

and inherently includes a receiver for receiving information over a wireless communication link. (Col. 7 line 67 through Col. 8 line 5 "mobile phone")

Wang differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting the receiver is for receiving a request message over the wireless link that requests additional features and the processor is automatically responsive to the request message to extract a second set of features from the digital version of the media sample and the transmitter is further to transmit the extracted second set.

In an analogous art, Barton teaches a system for identifying audio samples that includes a recursive feature for automatically requesting more information in order to

narrow the search results to find the corresponding file. (Page 5 [0048 and 0049] the “resolution of the derivation is coupled, in large measure, to the level of discrimination required in selecting an event to be triggered. As the number of potentially triggered events increases, the necessity to resolve ambiguity in the sample also increases”, Page 6 [0059] “the song excerpt may be increased in length, or a different excerpt may be furnished, in an iterative manner” until a song is identified and Page 7 [0067-0068]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the mobile station of Wang after modifying it to incorporate the ability to increase resolution to resolve ambiguity of Barton. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since it enables back and forth communication to resolve ambiguity. (Page 5 [0048-0049], Page 6 [0059] and Page 7 [0067-0068])

Regarding claim 2, Wang in view of Barton teaches the interface comprises a transducer. (Wang Col. 7 line 67 through Col. 8 line 5)

Regarding claim 3, Wang in view of Barton teaches the transducer comprises a microphone and the media sample comprises an audio sample. (Wang Col. 5 lines 36-59, Col. 7 line 67 through Col. 8 line 5, Fig. 1 [12] and Col. 15 lines 25-58)

Regarding claim 4, Wang in view of Barton teaches the transducer comprises a camera and the media sample comprises a visual sample. (Wang Col. 5 lines 36-59)

Regarding claim 5, Wang in view of Barton obviously teaches the interface comprises one of a cable and a wireless link. (Wang Col. 7 line 67 through Col. 8 line 5 and Col. 15 lines 25-58)

Regarding claim 6, Wang in view of Barton teaches the media sample that the interface receives is the digital version. (Wang Col. 15 lines 25-58)

Regarding claim 7, Wang in view of Barton teaches the transmitter is further configured to transmit a message that includes the at least one extracted feature and no portion of the digital version of the media sample. (Wang Col. 4 lines 23-32 [LPC coefficients and frequency components of spectrogram peaks])

Regarding claim 8, Wang in view of Barton teaches the processor is further configured to adaptively select a number of features to extract based on the digital version of the media sample. (Wang Col. 4 lines 23-32 [LPC coefficients and frequency components of spectrogram peaks])

Regarding claim 9, Wang in view of Barton teaches the processor is further configured to adaptively select at least one type of feature to extract based on the digital version of the media sample, the processor extracts at least one feature of the adaptively selected type, and wherein the transmitter is further configured to transmit an identifier of the selected type of feature. (Wang 4 lines 15-41 and Col. 7 line 3 through Col. 8 line 24)

Regarding 12, Wang in view of Barton teaches a user interface for causing the transmitter to transmit the first set of features, and a buffer to store at least a portion of the digital version of the media sample, wherein the processor extracts at least some of the first set prior to a user input at the said user interface. (Wang Col. 21 line 57 through Col. 22 line 50)

Regarding claim 16, Wang in view of Barton teaches a user interface (Wang Col. 5 lines 36-59 and Col. 7 line 67 through Col. 8 line 24) by which a single user input initiates:

the processor to extract the first set of features, a wireless communications link to be established between the MS and a communication service, and the extracted first set of features to be transmitted over the wireless communications link. (Wang Col. 6 line 61 through Col. 7 line 36 and Col. 7 line 67 through Col. 8 line 24)

Regarding claim 17, Wang in view of Barton teaches the single user input further initiates a buffer disposed between the transducer and the processor to begin storing at least a portion of the digital version of the media sample. (Wang Col. 15 line 25 through Col. 16 line 2)

Regarding claim 22, Wang in view of Barton teaches the request message specifically identifies each additional feature at least by type and the second set of features comprises only features of the said identified type. (Wang Col. 15 line 59 through Col. 16 line 2)

Regarding claim 23, Wang in view of Barton teaches a computer program, embodied on a computer readable medium within a mobile station (Wang Col. 7 line 67 through Col. 8 line 24), to process a media sample comprising:

a first set of computer instructions to extract in response to a user input, a first set of features from a digital media sample (Wang Col. 6 lines 14-34 and Fig. 1 [14]), and to extract in response to a received request message a second set of features consistent with additional features that are requested in the request message; (Barton

Page 5 [0048 and 0049] the "resolution of the derivation is coupled, in large measure, to the level of discrimination required in selecting an event to be triggered. As the number of potentially triggered events increases, the necessity to resolve ambiguity in the sample also increases", Page 6 [0059] "the song excerpt may be increased in length, or a different excerpt may be furnished, in an iterative manner" until a song is identified and Page 7 [0067-0068]) and

a second set of computer instructions to transmit in separate messages (Wang Col. 7 lines 3-11 and Col. 8 lines 16-21) the first and second sets of extracted features over a wireless communication link. (Wang Col. 7 line 67 through Col. 8 line 24)

Regarding claim 24, the limitations of claim 24 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 7.

Regarding claim 25, the limitations of claim 25 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 8.

Regarding claim 26, the limitations of claim 26 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 9.

Regarding claim 27, Wang in view of Barton teaches the ability to transmit extracted features and time-bounded segments. (Wang Col. 6 line 61 through Col. 7 line 11)

Regarding claim 30, Wang in view of Barton teaches at least one feature defines a timepoint, the first set of computer instructions is to extract at least one timepoint from the digital media sample, and one of said messages comprises a timepoint, a spectral slice of the digital media sample and an identifier that links the spectral slice to the

timepoint. (Wang Fig. 8A and Col. 6 line 35 through Col. 7 line 36, Col. 8 line 61 through Col. 9 line 32 and Col. 21 lines 13-29)

Regarding claim 37, Wang in view of Barton teaches a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium to uniquely match a plurality of extracted features to a feature set stored in a database comprising:

a first set of computer instructions to separately receive over a network a first and second message that includes first and second sets of received features (Wang Col. 7 lines 3-11 and Col. 7 line 67 through Col. 8 line 24), respectively;

a second set of computer instructions to search a database of feature sets for all matching sets that match the first set of received features and to determine a second set of at least one additional feature that distinguishes among each of the matching sets; (Barton Page 5 [0048-0049])

a third set of computer instructions to transmit over the network a request message that stipulates the second set of additional features; (Barton Page 5 [0048 and 0049] the "resolution of the derivation is coupled, in large measure, to the level of discrimination required in selecting an event to be triggered. As the number of potentially triggered events increases, the necessity to resolve ambiguity in the sample also increases", Page 6 [0059] "the song excerpt may be increased in length, or a different excerpt may be furnished, in an iterative manner" until a song is identified and Page 7 [0067-0068]) and

a fourth set of computer instructions to uniquely identify one feature set from among the matching sets using the second set of received features. (Barton Page 5

[0048-0051], Page 6 [0059], Page 7 [0067-0068] and Wang Col. 16 line 45 through Col. 17 line 39)

Regarding claim 38, Wang in view of Barton teaches each feature set is associated with a media file title (Wang Fig. 8B), the computer program further comprising a fifth set of computer instructions to transmit, over the network to a sender of the message, a reply message that includes the media file title. (Wang Fig. 1 [22] and Col. 6 lines 35-60)

Regarding claim 40, Wang in view of Barton teaches the fourth set of computer instructions further is to determine a link address for a media file uniquely associated with the uniquely identified feature set, and wherein the fifth set of computer instructions is further to transmit the link address in the reply message. (Barton Page 2 [0022-0023])

Regarding claim 47, Wang in view of Barton teaches the request message includes at least one of a number of additional features and a type of the at least one additional feature. (Wang Col. 12 line 38 through Col. 13 line 10 and Barton Page 5 [0048-0049])

Regarding claim 48, the limitations of claim 48 are rejected as being the same reasons set forth above in claim 23.

Regarding claim 49, Wang in view of Barton teaches the means for receiving a media sample comprises a transducer, and the means for extracting comprises a digital processor. (Wang Col. 7 line 12 through Col. 8 line 5 and Col. 15 lines 53-55)

Regarding claim 50, the limitations of claim 50 are rejected as being the same reasons set forth above in claim 1.

9. Claims 18-20 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Barton as applied to claim 1 and 23 above, and further in view of Ravago et al. (US-6,529,584 hereafter, Ravago).

Regarding claim 18, Wang in view of Barton teaches the limitations of claim 1 above, but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting extracting MPEG-7 descriptors from the digital version of the media sample.

In an analogous art, Ravago teaches an interactive audio delivery system that includes extracting MPEG-7 file information. (Col. 4 lines 29-61) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the real-time information searching system of Wang in view of Barton after modifying it to incorporate the MPEG-7 file information of Ravago. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since the audio tags can provide additional information to the user about the audio file. (Col. 4 lines 29-56)

Regarding claim 19, Wang in view of Barton and Ravago teaches the processor extracts MPEG-7 file information that is non-reconstructive of the digital version of the media sample. (Ravago Col. 4 lines 29-61 e.g. time value)

Regarding claim 20, Wang in view of Barton and Ravago teaches the extracted features (Ravago Col. 4 lines 29-61) for which the transmitter is to transmit are non-reconstructive of the digital version of the media sample. (Ravago Col. 4 lines 29-61)

Regarding claim 35, the limitations of claim 35 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 19.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew C. Sams whose telephone number is (571)272-8099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571)272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MCS
10/15/2007


GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER